# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/750,635 | 12/28/2000 | Chien-Sheng Chou | XER 2 0396 D/A0773 | 6973 |

| 7590 | 08/10/2005 |
|---|---|

Albert P. Sharpe, III
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP
7th Floor
1100 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BLAIR, DOUGLAS B |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2142 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/750,635 | CHOU ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Douglas B. Blair | 2142 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 May 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-19 and 21-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-19 and 21-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1.      A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.  Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114.  Applicant's submission filed on 5/25/2005 has been entered.

2.      Claims 1-7, 9-19 and 21-23 are currently pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.  Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.      Claims 1-6, 11-12, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent Number 6,920,430 to Berton et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,910,018 to

Okada et al..

5.      As to claim 1, Berton teaches a system for generating a requisition for user selectable

inventory items comprising: a client system connected to a network (Figure 4, reference number

401); a server computer system connected to the network, the network interconnecting the client

computer system and the server computer system, the client computer configured to allow a

plurality of users to access the server computer system (Figure 4), the server computer system

configured to: associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each

worksite defining a group of users (col. 4, lines 26-48, each user is associated with a government

agency which is considered a work site); associated inventory items with one or more of a

plurality of work sites using a validation rules database associating each of said user selectable

items with one or more of a plurality of work sites with which a user must be associated to

verify the user requested inventory item for a requisition (col. 4, lines 26-48, the eProcurement

system associates vendor items with each agency); identify associated inventory items which

may be requisitioned by a user associated with the one or more associated work sites (col. 4,

lines 26-48, the eProcurement system contains means for picking goods and services for the

agencies); receive and process a request for one or more user selected inventory items (col. 4,

line 49-col. 5, line 3); verify that each user requested inventory item is an item associated with

the user's one or more associated work sites (col. 4, lines 26-48, the eProcurement system

verifies that goods and services are available to the agencies); and generate a requisition for the

verified user requested inventory items (col. 4, line 49-col. 5, line 3); however Berton does not

explicitly teach the act of identifying associated inventory items which may not be requisitioned

by a user.

Okada teaches a sytem for generating a requisition for user selectable inventory items

comprising: the act of identifying associated inventory items which may not be requisitioned by

a user associated with a worksite(col. 18, lines 11-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Berton regarding a requisition system for

selecting items based on work site with the teachings of Okada regarding the selection of items

which may not be requisitioned by a user because some items may to be appropriate for certain

worksites (Okada, col. 1, lines 38-55).

6.      As to claim 2, Berton teaches a client computer system comprising a web browser for

accessing the network and communicating with the server over the network (col. 4, lines 26-48).

7.      As to claim 3, Okada teaches a server system comprising a requester database containing

one or more of a user identifier, a password, and personal information for the plurality of users

(col. 4, lines 40-63).

8.      As to claims 4 and 15, Okada teaches a requester database containing at least one shared

user entry, the shared entry associated with a single location (col. 4, lines 40-63).

9.      As to claim 5, Okada teaches a server system comprising a location database associating

at least one of a plurality of locations with each of the plurality of users (col. 4, lines 40-63).

10.     As to claim 6, Okada teaches a server computer comprising an inventory database

containing information about the user selectable items (col. 5, lines 3-19).

11.     As to claims 11 and 23, they feature the same limitations as claim 1 and are rejected for

the same reasons as claim 1.

12.     As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

13.     As to claim 13, Berton teaches a method wherein the client computer system and the

server computer system communicate via the Internet (col. 4, lines 26-48).

14.     Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Number 6,920,430 to Berton et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,910,018 to Okada et al. in

further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,415,320 to Hess et al..

15.     As to claim 7, the Berton-Okada combination teaches the system of claim 8, however the

Berton-Okada combination does not teach information comprising an item description and an

image.

        Hess teaches describing a sale item that with a description and an image (See Figure 6B).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Berton-Okada combination regarding a

system for purchasing with the teachings of Hess regarding the description of an item because a

description and an image provide an ideal way for a browser to show an item.

16.     Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent Number 6,920,430 to Berton et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,910,018 to Okada et

al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,636,863 to Friesen.

17.     As to claim 9, the Berton-Okada combination teaches the system of claim 10, however

the Berton-Okada combination does not explicitly teach a database storing a list of items pre-

selected by the user to be used at a later time to create a requisition.

        Friesen teaches database storing a list of items pre-selected by the user to be used at a

later time to create a requisition (col. 5, line 23-col. 6, line 3).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Berton-Okada combination regarding a

system for purchasing with the teachings of Friesen regarding storing a list of pre-selected items

because storing a list allows for greater flexibility for the client (Friesen, col. 3, line 52-col. 4,

line 35).

18.     As to claim 21, it features the same limitations as claim 9 and is rejected for the same

reasons as claim 9.

19.     Claims 10, 14, 17-18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over U.S. Patent Number 6,920,430 to Berton et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,910,018 to

Okada et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,987,423 to Arnold et al..

20.     As to claim 10, the Berton-Okada combination teaches the system of claim 1, however

the Berton-Okada combination does not explicitly teach a requisition database containing

information about a previously generated requisition.

        Arnold teaches a requisition database containing information about previously generated

requisitions (col. 18, lines 4-22).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Berton-Okada combination regarding a

system for purchasing with the teachings of Arnold regarding the storage of previously generated

requisitions because previously generated requisitions could be useful for creating new

requisitions (Arnold, col. 18, lines 4-22).

21.     As to claim 14, the Berton-Okada combination teaches the system of claim 1, however

the Berton-Okada combination does not explicitly teach retrieving information previously stored

for a user.

        Arnold teaches retrieving information previously stored for a user (col. 18, lines 4-22).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Berton-Okada combination regarding a

system for purchasing with the teachings of Arnold regarding retrieving information previously

stored for a user because previously stored information could be useful for creating new

requisitions (Arnold, col. 18, lines 4-22).

22.      As to claim 17, Arnold teaches retrieving previously stored information associated with

each user (col. 18, lines 4-22).

23.      As to claim 18, Arnold teaches retrieving previously stored information about user

selectable items (col. 18, lines 4-22).

24.      As to claim 22, it features the same limitations as claim 10 and is rejected for the same

reasons as claim 10.

25.      Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Number 6,920,430 to Berton et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,910,018 to Okada et al. in

further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475 to Barnes.

26.      As to claim 16, the Berton-Okada combination teaches the system of claim 11, however

the Berton-Okada combination does not teach a managerial account generating a requisition.

Barnes teaches a managerial account generating a requisition for a user (col. 25, lines 26-

40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Berton-Okada combination regarding a

system for purchasing with the teachings of Barnes regarding a managerial account generating a

requisition for a user because allowing a managerial account to set up requisitions reduces the

burden placed on other to complete requisitions (Barnes, col. 25, lines 26-40).

27.      Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Number 6,920,430 to Berton et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,910,018 to Okada et al. in

further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,987,423 to Arnold et al. and U.S. Patent Number

6,415,320 to Hess et al.

28.     As to claim 19, it features the same limitations as claim 7 and is rejected for the same

reasons as claim 7.


### Response to Arguments

29.     Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-19 and 21-23 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


### Conclusion

30.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is 571-272-3893. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Douglas Blair

KAMINI SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER